



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/834,614	04/16/2001	Akihiro Murata	109278	3898

25944 7590 05/05/2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

WANG, GEORGE Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2882

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/834,614

Applicant(s)

MURATA, AKIHIRO

Examiner

George Y. Wang

Art Unit

2882

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11,12 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11,12 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-12 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chun et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,522,002, from hereinafter "Chun") in view of Jacobowitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,337,388, from hereinafter "Jacobowitz").

2. Regarding claim 11, Chun discloses a three-dimensional mount assembly (fig. 2, ref. 201) comprising a molded body (fig. 2, ref. 216), a plurality of electronic parts (fig. 2, ref. 207, 208) attached to the molded body, and a plurality of interconnections (fig. 2, ref. 203, 205) electrically connected to the electronic parts and attached to the molded body such that the interconnections are exposed and leveled on more than one side (fig. 2, ref. 250, 223) of the molded body (fig. 2, ref. 216; col. 6, lines 3-8) that are different from each other.

However, the reference fails to disclose the sealing of the interconnections and the electronic parts to the molded body.

Jacobowitz discloses an optoelectric connector that attaches components by sealing them (fig. 6, ref. 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have sealed the electronic parts and the interconnections for attachment to the molded body since one would be motivated to provide permanence to the configuration. The technique of sealing is well known in the art to attach and bond a variety of components together and therefore does not admit novelty. Furthermore, according to Jacobowitz, the permanence of a seal also provides protection from environmental stresses (col. 2, lines 58-60).

3. As to claim 17-20, Chun discloses the three-dimensional mount assembly (fig. 3, ref. 301) as recited above where each of the electronic parts is an optical device and where the molded body has a hole (fig. 3, ref. 139) for linking an optical section of the optical device. Furthermore, Chun teaches an optical fiber (fig. 3, ref. 308) that provides optical linkage to other optical devices (fig. 3, ref. 107, 116) for optical transmission (fig. 3, ref. 303) via an optical connector (fig. 3, ref. 302) or plug.

4. Regarding claim 21, Chun discloses a three-dimensional mount assembly (fig. 2, ref. 201) comprising a molded body (fig. 2, ref. 216) with a first side by first molded area (fig. 2, ref. 216 left-top) and a second side by a second molded area (fig. 2, ref. 216 front-right), a plurality of electronic parts (fig. 2, ref. 207, 208) attached to the molded body, and a plurality of interconnections (fig. 2, ref. 203, 205) electrically connected to

the electronic parts and attached to the molded body such that the interconnections are exposed and leveled on more than one side (fig. 2, ref. 250, 223) of the molded body (fig. 2, ref. 216; col. 6, lines 3-8) that are different from each other.

However, the reference fails to disclose the sealing of the interconnections and the electronic parts to the molded body.

Jacobowitz discloses an optoelectric connector that attaches components by sealing them (fig. 6, ref. 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have sealed the electronic parts and the interconnections for attachment to the molded body since one would be motivated to provide permanence to the configuration. The technique of sealing is well known in the art to attach and bond a variety of components together and therefore does not admit novelty. Furthermore, according to Jacobowitz, the permanence of a seal also provides protection from environmental stresses (col. 2, lines 58-60).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10 March 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's amended claims add the limitation that the interconnections have exposed surfaces that are level with different sides of the molded body. Upon further inspection, Examiner finds that the Chun reference still reads on these limitations. Chun's molded body (fig. 2, ref. 216) is exposed on many sides. The ones cited by

Art Unit: 2882

examiner in the above rejection can be found on the side where the interconnection (fig. 2, ref. 250) is connected on a exposed surface level to that of the molded body in that area and the other at the interconnection (fig. 2, ref. 223) is connected on an exposed surface level to that of the molded body in that area. Therefore, Examiner holds to the validity of the references used and maintains rejection.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Y. Wang whose telephone number is 703-305-7242. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 703-305-3492. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 2882

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

gw
April 30, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Bruce", written in a cursive style.

DAVID V. BRUCE
PRIMARY EXAMINER